



RESTRICTED

RESTRICTED

- 2 -

for current world peace is generally characteristic of the first few comments about Moscow's reaction to date. But one commentator reminds that whatever happens in Korea "one should not think that the Soviet Union will surrender its plans for a world domination of Communism."

**KOREA AND THE SOVIET-COMMUNIST "PEACE CAMPAIGN":** Last week, the Soviet radio devoted a greater proportion (77%) of its foreign-affairs comment to the Stockholm-Appeal "peace campaign" than has been the case since this campaign was first launched. That the propaganda efforts of Moscow and its "peace partisans" will not be relaxed as a result of the Korean situation is suggested by their almost immediate incorporation of the "direct-aggression" theme into their "peace" line. Currently, the USSR is the scene of a Stockholm-Appeal signature drive, just announced, during which Moscow expects "unanimous support (of the Stockholm Appeal) by the entire Soviet people." "As developments in Korea go to show," says an official statement on the drive, "the American ruling circles already do not confine themselves to preparation of aggression, but have gone over to outright acts of aggression. (Thus), to the Soviet people, the enormous importance of the Stockholm Appeal is evident."\* As yet, however, Moscow has not mentioned atom weapons in the context of its references to the Korean situation. The only Communist source which does is the Soviet-controlled German press service. It quotes Max Schmidt, CDU Secretary in Saxony, to the effect that "the only possible interpretation of the demand by the American Representative Rivers for the use of atom bombs against the Korean People's Republic" is that "the dollar needs blood."

**WHAT IS THE USSR GOING TO DO?** Although no Western-oriented sources hazard direct predictions about the Soviet course of action, a few of them make general allusions to the subject. The MUNICH MERCURY, for example, feels that Soviet reaction to the President's decision "is so weak that it does not appear as if Stalin intends to get involved in a general war." A Swiss paper expects "that the men in the Kremlin will see reason after being shown that the West would rather risk a war than put up with further breaches of peace." And there are occasional observations that because the USSR has not firmly committed itself in Korea and because the U.S. has limited its intervention to the 38th parallel, the "Russians can withdraw without a loss of prestige." On the other hand, there are a few warnings that the Korean war might be a "diversionary feint to cover up a truly big move that is planned by the Kremlin" and that "meanwhile, the attention of the U.S. is drawn away from the other fronts of the cold war." The only allusion from a Communist or near-Communist source to the possible Soviet course of action appears in the Paris LIBERATION, a leftist paper which has frequently taken a pro-Communist line. It contends that "if the USSR answered Truman in his own violent tone,... then certainly world conflict would be inevitable." But "the USSR wants peace" and it has "given proof of this by keeping (its) calm and sang-froid in the face of the most violent provocations. This is not a sign of weakness, but of wisdom."

**INDIAN AND EGYPTIAN CRITICISMS:** Both the Bombay TIMES OF INDIA and the Lucknow NATIONAL HERALD\*\*criticize the President's decision. The TIMES argues: the Security Council's first resolution "cannot conceal the fact that the U.S. Government took the intervention decision on its own responsibility"; and the "hastily obtained sanction of the Security Council cannot condone the armed intervention...." Further, it opines that the U.N., "which did not hesitate to give a hearing to Hyderabad,... has certainly not added to its reputation of fairness by refusing even to listen to North Korea's case." The HERALD takes exception to the President's allegedly "far-fetched interpretation" which "enlarged the issue from one of restoring the status quo in Korea into one of fighting Communism along the Pacific arc." It argues for U.N. participation by the USSR and Communist China since without them world wars cannot be avoided. A Radio Cairo commentator takes exception not to the President's decision but to the "big powers' negligence in arming areas which are considered strategically important." For this reason, the U.S. itself is held "responsible" for the Korean blow. Warning that the Middle East is next on the Soviet timetable, the commentator hopes that the Western world will learn a lesson from Korea and that the U.S. will stop "wasting time by protecting and reinforcing Israel at the expense of the Arab countries. This only widens the gap between the U.S. and the Arab states... (where) America is sowing seeds of resentment and hate while Russia goes on with its unceasing plan of expansion."

\* In connection with the question of the USSR's attitude toward the U.N. as the result of the latter's Korean resolutions, it is of some interest that the statement pledged that the Soviet Government, in conformity with its "consistent" policy of peace and cooperation among nations, would "take the necessary measures through the U.N. and use all other channels for ensuring universal peace and international security."

\*\* The TIMES OF INDIA, the leading English daily of Western India, has recently, under a new editor, become anti-American and anti-Congress Party. The NATIONAL HERALD reflects the attitude of the left wing of the Congress Party.

RESTRICTED

RESTRICTED